1	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA			
2				
3	SUSAN MORAN and JOHN UDALL,	No. TX 97-00119		
4	SOSAN MONAN and JOHN ODALL,	No. TX 97-00113		
5	Plaintiffs,	No. TX 97-00150 (Consolidated)		
6	vs.			
7	GALE L. GARRIOTT, in his capacity as	NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT AND SETTLEMENT HEARINGS		
8	Director of the Arizona Department of Revenue, the ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE of the State of Arizona,			
9	,	(Assigned to the Honorable		
10	Defendants.	Mark W. Armstrong)		
11				
12	PLEASE READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY			
13	THIS NOTICE RELATES TO PENDING LITIGATION AND A PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF THIS LITIGATION AND CONTAINS IMPORTANT INFORMATION			
14				
15	AS TO RIGHTS YOU MAY HAVE TO RECEIV	VE TAX REFUNDS.		
16	YOUR RECEIPT OF THIS NOTICE DOES NOT INDICATE THAT YOU ARE ELIGIBLE FOR A REFUND OR THAT ANY CLAIM FILED BY YOU FOR A REFUND SHALL BE			
17	REVIEWED PURSUANT TO THE PROPOSE			
18	NOTICE.			
19	ALL DECISIONS ON WHETHER ANY REFUND CLAIM YOU FILED WILL BE			
20	REVIEWED FURTHER OR WHETHER YOU WILL BE CONSIDERED ELIGIBLE FOR ANY REFUND WILL BE COMMUNICATED TO YOU ONLY IF AND AFTER THE			
21	PROPOSED SETTLEMENT DISCUSSED I APPROVAL FROM THE COURT BEFORE W			
22				
23	NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A PROPOSED SETTLEMENT ("Settlement") HAS BEEN reached in the above-captioned Litigation ("Litigation"). The above named plaintiffs			
	("Plaintiffs") filed suit to recover the Arizona income taxes paid by federal employees on mandatory			
24	contributions to federal retirement programs ("Claimants"). It has been determined that the former Arizona tax law discriminated against certain of those federal employees in violation of 4 U.S.C. §			
25	111. The Litigation is back before the Tax Court upon remand from the Supreme Court of Arizon to address the Plaintiffs' Claims that additional refunds are due Claimants for one or more of the			
26	to address the Frankins Claims that additional left	EXHIBIT B-1		

- years 1985 to and including 1990. It has been finally determined that the Arizona Tax Law for years after 1990 does not unlawfully discriminate against federal employees. This notice is not an expression of any opinion by the Court as to the merits of any of the claims or defenses asserted by any party in this Litigation. The purpose of this notice is to inform you of the Court's order granting preliminary approval of the proposed Settlement, and to notify you of certain rights you may have.
- 1. <u>Terms of Proposed Settlement</u>. Subject to Tax Court approval and other conditions, the Plaintiffs and the Arizona Department of Revenue ("Department") have agreed on a Settlement under which the Department will evaluate certain individual refund claims ("Claim(s)") filed with the Department before July 9, 1998 for eligibility for further refunds. The refund payments will be in final settlement of all Claims by Claimants against the Department for the years 1985 to 1990. The proposed Settlement is a compromise of disputed claims and does not represent an admission of liability or responsibility on the part of the Department to pay refunds.
- 9 Α. **Eligibility for Refunds.** In 1998, the Department issued Individual Income Tax Ruling 98-1 ("ITR 98-1). Under this ruling, the Department paid refunds of certain individual 10 refund Claims. As part of its Settlement obligations, and except as stated below, the Department agrees to evaluate for further refund eligibility any individual refund Claim that was filed prior to 11 July 9, 1998 and that was either not previously evaluated for eligibility by the Department, or that 12 was previously denied as being "untimely" or for reasons that were not otherwise specified in the denial paperwork. However, the Department shall not evaluate further any Claims that the 13 Department previously denied for the following reasons: 1) because the Department determined that no sufficient evidence existed that the Claimant had made any federal retirement pension 14 contributions during the relevant tax year(s) (including those Claimants for whom the Department 15 had determined no sufficient evidence existed that they were employed by the federal government during the relevant tax year(s)); 2) because the Department determined no sufficient evidence 16 existed that the Claimant filed an Arizona tax return for the tax year for which the Claimant seeks a refund; or 3) because the Department determined that the Claimant had no Arizona tax liability or 17 paid no Arizona income taxes in the tax year(s) for which the Claimant made his or her Claim(s). 18 All Claims falling within the foregoing three (3) categories are referred to hereafter as the "Denied Claims." The Department shall also not evaluate further any Claims for any years on which any 19 refund payment has been made previously by the Department (the "Paid Claims"), and all such Claims shall be considered by all parties to have been paid in full for the years paid. 20
 - In deciding which tax years each Claim's eligibility for refund or credit will be evaluated for, the Department will evaluate any Claim eligible for review that was filed using the protective claim form issued by the Department with the 1990 Arizona income tax form (the "1990 Claim Form") for eligibility in tax years 1985 through 1990, except to the extent the Claim already qualifies as a Denied Claim or Paid Claim for any of those tax years. The Department will evaluate all Claims eligible for review that were not filed on the 1990 Claim Form for eligibility only for any of the tax years 1985 though 1990 expressly identified by the Claimant on his/her Claim filing. Thus, for example, a protective claim form filed in 1995 checking boxes for 1990, 1992 and 1993 will only be evaluated for eligibility in 1990. However, evaluated Claims that expressly indicate a Claim for

EXHIBIT B-1

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1990, or that designate no particular tax year will be first evaluated for eligibility in tax year 1990. If such a Claim is determined to be eligible for refund or credit in 1990, including a Paid Claim for 1990, the Department shall then evaluate the Claim for eligibility in 1989, and, so long as the evaluations of such Claims continue to show eligibility for refund or credit in the year under review, the Department shall review the Claim for eligibility in the preceding year stopping after any review necessitated by these terms for eligibility in tax year 1985. At the point at which the evaluation determines that such a Claim is not eligible for refund or credit in a given year, the Department shall not evaluate the Claim for eligibility in any preceding year. At no point shall any Paid Claim be evaluated for further refund or credit eligibility. Also, Claims that specifically designate only years after 1990 will not be reviewed for eligibility, but will be denied as failing to file an eligible claim. For instance, if a Claimant filed a 1995 claim form marking 1992, 1993 and 1994 as the relevant claim years, the Department will not review the Claim for eligibility.

In determining eligibility the Department shall first attempt to access substantially the same types of data sources used to review claims under the program implemented pursuant to ITR 98-1. The Department intends to utilize such data to the extent such data is still available to the Department, and in the forms, if any, that such data has been supplemented or restored since the release of ITR 98-1. In determining eligibility, the Department will attempt to review all data in its possession which is feasible and relevant to the eligibility review. To the extent, if any, that the Department does not have the necessary data in its possession, the Department will request the data from the Claimant.

B. Refund Calculation. In calculating refunds, the Department shall follow a process similar to that used in determining the initial refunds paid in the Litigation during 1998 under the program implemented pursuant to ITR 98-1.

C. <u>Additional Information</u>. In the case of some Claimants, the Department may need additional information to determine whether a refund is due and the amount of any refund. There is no requirement for a Claimant to file anything at this time. In the event additional information is required to determine your entitlement or the amount of the refund due you, you will be notified in writing by the Department. However, to minimize the possibility of subsequent delay, Claimants are encouraged to take steps to preserve whatever tax records they may have for tax years 1985 to and including 1990, including, but not limited to, Arizona tax returns, federal tax returns, W-2's, and any related documents, statements or other records concerning mandatory contributions to federal retirement programs.

D. Pending Appeals and Deadlines for Appeal. Pursuant to the terms of the June 17, 1998 Judgment ("1998 Judgment") previously filed and entered in this Litigation, administrative action by the Department on appeals of previously Denied Claims has been stayed. Upon entry of a final judgment approving this Settlement, the stay on these pending administrative appeals and of any unexpired deadlines for appeals of previously Denied Claims will be lifted and the Department will continue to process appeals of Denied Claims pursuant to the existing administrative appeals procedures of the Department.

- E. <u>Claims Not Eligible for Further Review</u>. Within a reasonable time after entry of a final judgment approving the Settlement, the Department shall notify Claimants whose Claims are not eligible for further review (for example, Claims filed on or after July 9, 1998). Appeals of the Department's determinations must be made in accordance with the existing administrative appeals procedures of the Department.
- F. <u>Calculation Notice</u>. The Department has reserved the right to inform each Claimant by written notice of its refund calculation prior to issuing the refunds. The notice will also set forth the administrative appeals procedure for Claimants to object to any refund notice.
- G. Other Debts. If a Claimant is indebted to the State of Arizona or the United States, a refund under the Settlement will be offset against such debts to the extent authorized by law.
- **H.** Costs of Settlement Administration. The Department shall bear all costs of administering the Settlement; provided, however, that the Settlement is contingent upon the Department obtaining sufficient additional appropriations from the Arizona Legislature to allow the Department to implement the evaluation process agreed upon without using the Department's normal operating funds.
- 16 J. Administrative Appeals. All appeals of any determination of the Department under the Settlement shall be pursuant to the existing administrative appeals procedures of the Department and Arizona law.
- **K.** Community Property, Decedents and Undeliverable Refunds. In resolving disputes of divorced Claimants and in determining the process for determining the disposition of undeliverable refunds and refunds of deceased Claimants, the Department shall exercise its discretion under the statutes governing these matters.
- **L.** <u>Subsequent Notice</u>. Status reports as to developments, if any, in the administration of the Settlement will be posted on the Department's internet website, www.azdor.gov.
- Plaintiffs' Counsel. Plaintiffs' counsel are Randall D. Wilkins, Paul V. Bonn, Brian J. Campbell and D. Michael Hall of Bonn & Wilkins, Chartered, Phoenix, Arizona and Eugene O. Duffy and William A. Wiseman of O'Neil, Cannon, Hollman, DeJong S.C., Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Plaintiffs' Counsel may be contacted in writing at: FERC2 Refund Litigation, P.O. Box 1289, EXHIBIT B-1

Phoenix.	Arizona	85001-1289.

2 3. Recommendation of Plaintiffs' Counsel. Plaintiffs' Counsel have been engaged in the Litigation of this dispute for 16 years. They have conducted a thorough and intensive examination into the facts and law relating to the final phase of this Litigation — the entitlement of Claimants to additional refunds and the delay and risks to Claimants in view of the defenses available to the Department to reduce or avoid the payments of refunds otherwise due.

5

6

1

Among other things, the Settlement provides Claimants eligible for refunds under the terms of the Settlement with certainty of payment and the elimination of further delay. Based upon their evaluation of the benefits which the Settlement will provide to Claimants, Plaintiffs' Counsel have advised Plaintiffs that the Settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate.

8

10

11

- 4. **Final Approval Hearing**. The Tax Court has preliminarily approved the Settlement. However, final approval will not be granted until after the final Settlement approval hearing ("Final Approval Hearing"). The Final Approval Hearing will be held before the Honorable Mark W. Armstrong on August 4, 2006, at 9:00 a.m., Arizona time, Maricopa County Superior Court, Northeast Regional Court Center, 18380 North 40th Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85032, Courtroom 109. The purpose of the Final Approval Hearing is to determine whether the Settlement should be finally approved by the Tax Court. The Final Approval Hearing may be adjourned by the Tax Court.
- finally approved by the Tax Court. The Final Approval Hearing may be adjourned by the Tax Court from time to time without further notice.
- **Right to Appear at Final Hearing**. At the Final Approval Hearing, any Claimant may 14 appear in person or through counsel and be heard concerning the fairness, reasonableness and 15 adequacy of the Settlement. Claimants who support the proposed Settlement do not need to appear at the hearing or take any other action to indicate their approval. However, no person will be heard 16 in opposition to the Settlement or the determination of attorneys' fees and costs and no papers submitted by any person will be considered by the Tax Court unless, on or before June 26, 2006, 17 such person (a) files with the Clerk of the Maricopa County Superior Court, Central Courthouse, 201 18 West Jefferson, Phoenix, Arizona 85003 a notice of his/her intention to appear, together with proof of status as a Claimant and a written statement that details the specific objection and basis for such 19 objection; (b) if the objection concerns attorneys' fees, files an affidavit attesting to whether the Claimant received the prior written notice of the Tax Court's fee hearing held on April 3, 1998, and 20 whether the Claimant received any refunds under ITR 98-1, and (c) serves copies of any papers filed

2122

23

24

25

26

28

with the Tax Court upon each of the following attorneys:

1	PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL	COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS			
2	Randall D. Wilkins, Esq. FERC2 Refund Litigation	William A. Richards, Esq. Senior Litigation Counsel - CIVIL DIVISION			
	Attention: Objections to	Attention: Objections			
3	FERC2 Settlement	1275 West Washington			
4	P.O. Box 1289 Phoenix, Arizona 85001-1289	Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2926			
5	Filoeliix, Alizolia 65001-1269				
6	All documents filed with the Tax Court shall be signed pursuant to Rule 11, Ariz. R. Civ. F				
7		und case arises where a successful suit, brought by			
8					
9	determined that this case is a common fund case and that the total refunds and interest paid by the Department under the program implemented pursuant to ITR 98-1 constituted the common fund.				
10	The Settlement represents a compromise of disputed Claims to enforce the 1998 Judgment, which results in a monetary fund for the benefit of the Claimants who meet the eligibility requirements for a refund under the Settlement.				
11					
12	7. Attorneys' Fees . Consistent with the	e provisions of the 1998 Judgment, Plaintiffs' Counsel			
13	have applied for an award of 20 percent of the Common Fund under the Settlement for their services				
14	A 11 / 111 1 11 A / A 2006 / 0.00 A 1 / 34 1 C / G / G				
15					
16	person or through counsel and be heard concerning the application of Plaintiffs' Counsel for the award of attorneys' fees and expenses. However, no person will be heard in opposition to Plaintiffs'				
17	Counsel's application and no papers submitted by any person will be considered by the Tax Cour unless he or she files and serves all papers in the manner specified in paragraph 5 above.				
18	unless he of she mes and serves an papers in	the manner specified in paragraph 3 above.			
19		ached you at an address other than the address printed ed, please send your current address to the Arizona			
20	Department of Revenue, P.O. Box 29099	9, Phoenix, Arizona 85038-9099, attention FERC			
21	any of the years 1985 to and including 1990, please also include your spouse's name, social security				
22					
23					
24					
25					

Examination of Papers. This summary of the Settlement and the description of the

6

EXHIBIT B-1

26

27

9.

1	Litigation is not intended to be complete or exhaustive. For a more detailed statement of the matters involved in this Litigation, including all the terms of the Settlement, you are referred to the			
2	Stipulation of Settlement dated April 19, 2006 and to the pleadings, motions, transcripts and other documents filed in this Litigation, including the 1998 Judgment, all of which are on file with the Clerk and which may be examined during regular business hours at the office of the Clerk of the Court Records, Maricopa County Superior Court, 601 West Jackson, Phoenix, Arizona 85003. The Stipulation of Settlement may also be reviewed at the Department's internet website at			
3				
4				
5	www.azdor.gov and at Plaintiffs' Counsel's website at www.ferc2refunds.com.			
6	10. <u>Further Proceedings</u> . If the Settlement is approved by the Tax Court, the process of			
7	implementing the Settlement will begin without delay. Upon the final payment by the Department of all sums due Claimants and Plaintiffs' Counsel, and satisfaction of all of the Department's obligations under the Settlement, the Plaintiffs will file a satisfaction of the 1998 Judgment and any final judgment entered pursuant to the Settlement. If the Settlement is not approved, the case will			
8				
9	continue to be prepared for trial or other judicial resolution of the claims and defenses on the issues of whether Claimants are eligible for additional refunds and, if so, the amount of refunds due to			
10	Claimants and whether the case should be certified as a class action.			
11	PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE JUDGE OR THE COURT CLERK'S OFFICE.			
12	Any correspondence or questions you may have about the matters in this notice may be directed to			
13	the Department.			
14	PLEASE REMEMBER TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME, SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER AND CURRENT ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBER IN ALL			
15				
16	please also include your spouse's name, social security number and current address and telephone number (if different).			
17	DATED this 25th day of April, 2006.			
18	DATED this 25th day of April, 2000.			
19				
20	/s/ Mark W. Armstrong			
21	Hon. Mark W. Armstrong Judge of the Superior Court			
22				
23				
24				
25				
43				